
A BATTLE TO BE FOUGHT BEFORE TH

POINTS RAISED IN THE MINORITY REPORT

IT SHOWS THAT THE FEDERAL ELECTION LAWS
HAVE BEEN AFFIRMED BY THE SUPREME
COURT AS TO THEIR LEGALITY, AND
COMMENDED BY DEMOCRATIC

ITY—THE LAWS OF THE
SOUTHERN STATES.

Washington, Sept. 24.—The fight over the Tucker bill repealing the Federal Election Law will be a vigorous and determined contest. To what lengths of tyranny and audacity the Democrats are prepared to go to secure a quick vote on it was shown by the performances of Speaker Crisp and his partisan majority last week. Having adopted rules permitting dilatory motions, they proceeded to disregard these rules, and refused to

or appeals from Crisp's decisions so refusing. In other words, the Speaker simply stood up and said: "We did not adopt rules preventing obstruction, because to do so would be to follow the leadership of Thomas B. Reed somewhat too humbly, and to go back on our records somewhat too badly. But we mean to stop obstruction just the same whenever it suits us to do so, as, for instance, in the matter of this Tucker bill. And we shall do it in the simplest way possible—by just letting

Speaker's desk, sustained by our partisan quorum, forcing the Republicans back into their seats as fast as they get upon their feet."

SPEAKER CRISP'S COURSE.

That is what they did. While the question was before the House whether the Committee on Rules should be discharged to report its sole business, the Speaker, by the aid of his party, kept the

ing forward the Tucker bill, Speaker Crisp took the question into his own hands, and decided that the report was then before the House. While

the question was pending when it should be read. Mr. Crisp directed it to be read then and there, and although a score of lawful motions were made to delay the reading, Mr. Crisp declared them all out of order, and refused to allow any appeal to the House from his decisions. Such tyranny was in our

ous contrast with the Speaker's mild and most orderly behavior while the subject before the House was silver repeal. It took an agreement among all parties and factions to get the Repeal bill voting fixed. The country was in the throes of a com-

Europe at the rate of six millions a week. The Treasury reserve was low and rapidly falling beyond the danger point. Mills were idle, factories closed, mechanics walking the streets by tens of thousands, the great American Cities, with half their population unemployed.

in rebellion against its Administration's decree that it must perform its pledge, and with his own long free-coinage record staring him in the face, could do nothing to expedite repeal, to stop the panic, to restore business confidence, to reopen the mills and factories, until every step of the procedure had been definitely arranged in the conference of the factions.

NO CONFERENCE NEEDED.

But he had power unlimited and a resolution which not even his own code of rules could restrain or hinder where the matter to be promoted was a piece of partisan politics, a scheme to leave Southern gentlemen unweaved in their determination to hold the offices, whatever might be the popular will. No conferences or arrangements were needed to supply him with authority.

then. He went about the execution of this scheme in a manner characteristic of it and appropriate to it. It was a scheme to render lawlessness safe and easy, and with lawless force it pushed it forward. It was a scheme to suppress the voice of the people, and he began to put it through by suppressing the voice of Congress. It was a scheme to obliterate the laws to secure fair and free voting, and he entered upon it by openly trampling under foot the rules of Congress.

Something highly effective has been done, however, toward an expression of the views of Republicans by the minority of the Committee on Elections. The minority members are Mr. Johnson, of North Dakota; Mr. Hainer, of McDowell, Mr. Northway and Mr. Curtis, of New-York, and their report, though hastily prepared, is full of vigor and sound sense. It recalls the significant fact that in their hurry the majority members neither permitted evidence to be taken before the committee as to the operation of the laws proposed to be repealed, nor allowed the minority to see the report in which that proposition was urged. Everything has been done under the whip and as if final action

were a matter of the greatest urgency, above more than a year must pass before it could have any application. The grounds on which repeal is demanded being thus kept secret, the minority can only surmise them or accept current rumors. It is supposed they are the old Southern doctrine of unconstitutionality, and the new Mugwump

WHAT THE STATUTES PROVIDE.

Having recited the statutes in full as the stand, having shown that there is absent from them everything in the nature of forcible inte-

for a non-partisan watch of the electoral process and for the arrest and trial in the Federal court of only such persons as are engaged in acts which all admit to be criminal, having remarked

that all these laws have been in operation for twenty years or more, have been administered by both the political parties, and commended by the leaders of both, and that all the evidence existing upon which to form a judgment of these

The times, places and manner of holding elections for Senators and Representatives shall be prescribed in each State by its Legislature thereof; but the Congress may at any time by law make or alter such regulations, except as to places of choosing Senators.

to show that it was the plain and undoubted purpose of the makers of the Constitution to reposit in Congress the ultimate and supreme authority to direct and control Congressional elections, and the view of that high Democratic authority, Mr. George Tinkins Curtis, is cited, in whose "Constitutional History" occurs the conclusion that "the text of the fundamental law, as finally settled" would seem to confer (on Congress) a power which, when exercised, must be paramount whether a State regulation exists at the time or not."

of a law "is as nearly conclusive as anything human can be," and, having recourse to the books it finds the views of the Court as to the sufficiency of these laws most amply recorded. In "ex parte Stoheld," a case arising under the statutes in question, the Court, affirming their legality, said:—

"Make or alter?" What is the plain meaning of the words? There is no declaration that the regulation shall be made either wholly by the State legislatures wholly by Congress. If Congress does not interfere, course they may be made wholly by the State; but